US-03-10

arXiv:hep-ph/0312207v2 8 Feb 2004

Universal Texture of Quark and Lepton Mass Matrices with an Extended Flavor $2 \leftrightarrow 3$ Symmetry

Yoshio Koide and Yoshio Koide
Department of Physics, University of Shizuoka,
52-1 Yada, Shizuoka, 422-8526 Japan
E-mail: koide@u-shizuoka-ken.ac.jp
(Dated: February 1, 2008)

Against the conventional picture that the mass matrix forms in the quark sectors will take somewhat different structures from those in the lepton sectors, on the basis of an idea that all the mass matrices of quarks and leptons have the same texture, a universal texture of quark and lepton mass matrices is proposed by assuming a discrete symmetry Z$_3$ and an extended flavor $2 \leftrightarrow 3$ symmetry. The texture is described by three parameters (including phase parameter). According to this ansatz, the neutrino masses and mixings are investigated.

PACS numbers: 12.15.Ff, 14.60.Pq, 11.30.Hv

I. INTRODUCTION

From the point of view of the quark and lepton unification, an idea that their matrix forms are described by a universal texture is very attractive. Especially, against the conventional picture that the mass matrix forms in the quark sectors will take somewhat different structures from those in the lepton sectors, it is interesting to investigate whether or not all the mass matrices of quarks and leptons can be described in terms of the same mass matrix form as in the neutrinos. Recently, a quark and lepton mass matrix model based on a discrete symmetry Z$_3$ and a flavor $2 \leftrightarrow 3$ symmetry has been proposed [1]. In the model (we will refer it as Model I hereafter), the quark and lepton mass matrices M_f are given by the texture

$$M_f = P_f \widehat{M}_f P_f \ , \tag{1.1}$$

where $\widehat{M}_f$ is a real matrix with a form

$$\widehat{M}_f = a_f \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + b_f \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & x_f \\ 0 & x_f & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_f & a_f \\ a_f & b_f & b_f x_f \\ a_f & b_f x_f & b_f \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{1.2}$$

and P_f is a phase matrix defined by

$$P_f = \mathrm{diag}(e^{i\delta_1^f},\ e^{i\delta_2^f},\ e^{i\delta_3^f}) \ . \tag{1.3}$$

(As seen in the expression in Eq. (1.2), the model is essentially based on a two Higgs doublet model.) As we see in the next section, Model I can give interesting results in the quark and lepton mass matrix phenomenology. However, in the model, the $2 \leftrightarrow 3$ symmetry has been required only for the mass matrix $\widehat{M}_f$, not for the fields ν_{Li}. The phase matrix P_f in Eq. (1.1), which breaks the $2 \leftrightarrow 3$ symmetry, has been introduced from a phenomenological point of view.

In the present model, we propose a universal texture of quark and lepton mass matrices

$$M_f = a_f \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{-i\phi_f} & 1 \\ e^{-i\phi_f} & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + b_f \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2i\phi_f}1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{1.4}$$

which is similar to the matrix (1.1), but does not include the phenomenological phase matrix (1.3). (The phases $e^{-i\phi}$ and $e^{-2i\phi}$ in the matrix (1.4) are introduced by an "extended $2 \leftrightarrow 3$ symmetry which will be discussed in Sec. III.) In comparison with Model I where the texture (1.1) has 5 parameters, a_f, b_f, x_f, $\delta_1^f - \delta_2^f$ and $\delta_2^f - \delta_3^f$, the present model (1.4) has only 3 parameters, a_f, b_f and ϕ_f, so that the 3 mass eigenvalues can completely determine the 3 parameters a_f, b_f and ϕ_f. As a result, for example, we will obtain a prediction

$$|V_{cb}| \simeq \frac{m_s}{m_b} + \frac{m_c}{m_t} \ , \tag{1.5}$$

differently from Model I, where $|V_{cb}|$ has been given by $|V_{cb}| = \cos(\delta_3 - \delta_2)/2$, where $\delta_i = \delta_i^u - \delta_i^d$, and the value $|V_{cb}|$ has been freely adjustable by the parameter $\delta_3 - \delta_2$.

In the next section, Sec. II, we will give a brief review of Model I, because the present model is closely related to Model I. In Sec. III, by introducing an extended flavor $2 \leftrightarrow 3$ symmetry, we will propose a new universal texture of quark and lepton mass matrices and we will investigate quark mass matrix phenomenology. In Sec. IV, we will discuss the neutrino mass matrix M_ν on the basis of the new universal texture. Prediction of $\sin^2 2\theta_{atm}$ and $|(V_\ell)_{13}|^2$ are given only in terms of the charged lepton mass ratios, independently of the parameters in M_ν. Predictions of $R = \Delta m^2_{solar}/\Delta m^2_{atm}$ and $\tan^2\theta_{solar}$ depends on two adjustable parameters in M_ν. We will give predictions for some typical values of the parameters. Finally, Sec. V is devoted to a summary and discussion.

II. TWO HIGGS DOUBLET MODEL WITH A Z$_3$ SYMMETRY

In the present section, we give a brief review of Model I [1].

We assume that under a discrete symmetry Z$_3$, the quark and lepton fields ψ_L, which belong to 10_L, $\overline{5}_L$ and 1_L of SU(5) ($1_L = \nu_R^c$), are transformed as

$$\psi_{1L} \to \psi_{1L}, \quad \psi_{2L} \to \omega\psi_{2L}, \quad \psi_{3L} \to \omega\psi_{3L}, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\omega = e^{2i\pi/3}$. [Although we use a terminology of SU(5), at present, we do not consider the SU(5) grand unification.] Then, the bilinear terms $\overline{q}_{Li}u_{Rj}$, $\overline{q}_{Li}d_{Rj}$, $\overline{\ell}_{Li}\nu_{Rj}$, $\overline{\ell}_{Li}e_{Rj}$ and $\overline{\nu}^c_{Ri}\nu_{Rj}$ [$\nu_R^c = (\nu_R)^c = C\overline{\nu_R}^T$ and $\overline{\nu}_R^c = \overline{(\nu_R^c)}$] are transformed as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \omega^2 & \omega^2 \\ \omega^2 & \omega & \omega \\ \omega^2 & \omega & \omega \end{pmatrix} . \tag{2.2}$$

Therefore, if we assume two SU(2) doublet Higgs scalars H_A and H_B, which are transformed as

$$H_A \to \omega H_A, \quad H_B \to \omega^2 H_B, \tag{2.3}$$

we obtain the mass matrix form

$$M_f = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a^f_{12} & a^f_{13} \\ a^f_{12} & 0 & 0 \\ a^f_{13} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \langle H_A^0\rangle + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b^f_{22} & b^f_{23} \\ 0 & b^f_{23} & b^f_{33} \end{pmatrix} \langle H_B^0\rangle \ . \tag{2.4}$$

In addition to the Z$_3$ symmetry, we assume a $2 \leftrightarrow 3$ symmetry for the matrix $\widehat{M_f}$ which is given by Eq. (1.2). (The $2 \leftrightarrow 3$ symmetry does not mean the permutation $2 \leftrightarrow 3$ symmetry for the fields ψ_{2L} and ψ_{3L}.) Hereafter, for simplicity, we will sometimes drop the index f and denote $a^f\langle H_A^0\rangle$ and $b^f\langle H_B^0\rangle$ as a_f and b_f, respectively. Then, we obtain the universal texture (1.1) with Eq. (1.2) for the quark and lepton mass matrices.

Since the present model has two Higgs doublets horizontally, flavor-changing neutral currents (FCNCs) are, in general, caused by the exchange of Higgs scalars. However, this FCNC problem is a common subject to be overcome not only in the present model but also in most models with two Higgs doublets. The conventional mass matrix models based on a GUT scenario cannot give realistic mass matrices without assuming more than two Higgs scalars [2]. Besides, if we admit that two such scalars remain until the low energy scale, the well-known beautiful coincidence of the gauge coupling constants at $\mu \sim 10^{16}$ GeV will be spoiled. For these problems, we optimistically consider that only one component of the linear combinations among those Higgs scalars survives at the low energy scale $\mu = m_Z$, while the other component is decoupled at $\mu < M_X$. Such an optimistic scenario in a multi-Higgs doublet model is indeed possible, and the example can be found, for example, in Ref. [3].

The Hermitian matrix $H = MM^\dagger$ is diagonalized by a unitary matrix U_L as

$$U_L^\dagger H U_L = \mathrm{diag}(m_1^2, m_2^2, m_3^2) \ , \tag{2.5}$$

$$U_L = PR \ , \tag{2.6}$$

$$R = \left(\begin{array}{ccc} c & s & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}s & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}s & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{array} \right) \ , \tag{2.7}$$

$$s = \sin\theta = \sqrt{\frac{m_1}{m_1+m_2}} \ , \quad c = \cos\theta = \sqrt{\frac{m_2}{m_1+m_2}} \ , \tag{2.8}$$

$$\begin{array}{rcl} -\,m_1 &=& \frac{1}{2}\left[b(1+x) - \sqrt{8a^2 + b^2(1+x)^2} \right] \ , \\ m_2 &=& \frac{1}{2}\left[b(1+x) + \sqrt{8a^2 + b^2(1+x)^2} \right] \ , \\ m_3 &=& b(1-x) \ , \end{array} \tag{2.9}$$

where a, b and x are real parameters given in Eq. (1.2) [1]. When we consider $m_3 > m_2 > m_1$, we can obtain the Cabibbo–Kobayashi–Maskawa [4] (CKM) matrix V,

$$V = U_{uL}^\dagger U_{dL} = R_u^T P R_d = \left(\begin{array}{ccc} c_u c_d + \rho s_u s_d & c_u s_d - \rho s_u c_d & -\sigma s_u \\ s_u c_d - \rho c_u s_d & s_u s_d + \rho c_u c_d & \sigma c_u \\ -\sigma s_d & \sigma c_d & \rho \end{array} \right) \ , \tag{2.10}$$

where

$$P = P_u^\dagger P_d = \mathrm{diag}(e^{i\delta_1}, e^{i\delta_2}, e^{i\delta_3}) \ , \tag{2.11}$$

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2}(e^{i\delta_3} + e^{i\delta_2}) = \cos\frac{\delta_3 - \delta_2}{2} \exp i\left(\frac{\delta_3 + \delta_2}{2} \right) \ , \tag{2.12}$$

$$\sigma = \frac{1}{2}(e^{i\delta_3} - e^{i\delta_2}) = \sin\frac{\delta_3 - \delta_2}{2} \exp i\left(\frac{\delta_3 + \delta_2}{2} + \frac{\pi}{2} \right) \ , \tag{2.13}$$

where we have taken $\delta_1 = 0$ without losing generality. The result (2.10) leads to the following phase-parameter-independent predictions [5]

$$\left| \frac{V_{ub}}{V_{cb}} \right| = \frac{s_u}{c_u} = \sqrt{\frac{m_u}{m_c}} = 0.0586 \pm 0.0064 \ , \tag{2.14}$$

$$\left| \frac{V_{td}}{V_{ts}} \right| = \frac{s_d}{c_d} = \sqrt{\frac{m_d}{m_s}} = 0.224 \pm 0.014 \ , \tag{2.15}$$

where we have used the values [6] at $\mu = m_Z$ as the quark mass values. Although the prediction (2.14) is somewhat small compared with the observed value [7] $|V_{ub}/V_{cd}| = (3.6 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-3}/(4.12 \pm 2.0) \times 10^{-2} \simeq 0.087$, the prediction (2.10) is satisfactory, roughly speaking. For the neutrino mass matrix M_ν, by taking $\delta_3 - \delta_2 = \pi/2$, we can obtain [1] a satisfactory prediction of the lepton mixing matrix $V_\ell = U_e^\dagger U_\nu$ with a nearly bimaximal mixing.

On the other hand, very recently, it has been pointed out by Matsuda and Nishiura [8] that if we assign the up-quark masses as $(m_{u1}, m_{u2}, m_{u3}) = (m_u, m_t, m_c)$ (they have called it Type B) in contrast to the assignment $(m_{d1}, m_{d2}, m_{d3}) = (m_d, m_s, m_b)$ (Type A) in the mass eigenvalues (2.9), then we can obtain phase-parameter-independent relations

$$\left| \frac{V_{ub}}{V_{tb}} \right| = \frac{s_u}{c_u} = \sqrt{\frac{m_u}{m_t}} = (3.6 \pm 0.5) \times 10^{-3} \ , \tag{2.16}$$

$$\left| \frac{V_{cd}}{V_{cs}} \right| = \frac{s_d}{c_d} = \sqrt{\frac{m_d}{m_s}} = 0.224 \pm 0.014 \ , \tag{2.17}$$

instead of the relations (2.14) and (2.15). (We will refer this model as Model II.) The relation (2.16) is in excellent agreement with the observed value [7] $|V_{ub}| = (3.6 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-3}$, because we have known $|V_{tb}| \simeq 1$. The relation (2.17) is consistent with the well-known relation [9] $|V_{us}| \simeq \sqrt{m_d/m_s}$, because we have known $|V_{cs}| \simeq 1$ and $|V_{cd}| \simeq |V_{us}|$.

Thus, the new assignment of the quark masses by Matsuda and Nishiura seems to be favorable phenomenologically. However, why is such different assignment between the up- and down-quark masses caused?

When such the inverse assignment is caused in the up-quark sector, the up-quark mixing matrix U_{uL} is given by

$$U_{uL} = P_u R_u T_{23} \ , \tag{2.18}$$

where

$$T_{23} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{2.19}$$

so that the CKM mixing matrix V is given by

$$V = T_{23} R_u^T P R_d = \begin{pmatrix} c_u c_d + \rho s_u s_d & c_u s_d - \rho s_u c_d & -\sigma s_u \\ -\sigma s_d & \sigma c_d & \rho \\ s_u c_d - \rho c_u s_d & s_u s_d + \rho c_u c_d & \sigma c_u \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{2.20}$$

instead of the relation (2.10). The new CKM matrix (2.20) predicts

$$|V_{cb}| = |\rho| = \cos \frac{\delta_3 - \delta_2}{2} \ , \tag{2.21}$$

instead of the old prediction $|V_{cb}| \simeq \sin(\delta_3 - \delta_2)/2$. In order to give the observed value $|V_{cb}| = 0.0412$, we must take $\delta_3 - \delta_2 = \pi - \varepsilon$ with $\varepsilon = 4.27^\circ$. In the mass matrix form (1.1), the phase matrix P_f has been introduced as a measure of the phenomenological $2 \leftrightarrow 3$ symmetry breaking. (We have assumed that the $2 \leftrightarrow 3$ symmetry is broken only by the phase parameters.) Therefore, it is natural to consider that such phase parameters δ_i^f show $|\delta_i^f| \ll 1$. What is the origin of such a large value $\delta_3 - \delta_2 \simeq \pi$?

III. UNIVERSAL TEXTURE OF QUARK AND LEPTON MASS MATRICES

Stimulated by Model II [8], in the present section, let us speculate a new universal texture of the quark and lepton mass matrices.

We consider that the different assignment between the up- and down-quark masses in Model II is caused by the difference of the initial values of the parameters a_f, b_f and c_f between the up- and down-quark sectors in the texture (1.2). In fact, the mass hierarchies $m_3 > m_2 > m_1$ or $m_2 > m_3 > m_1$ take place according as $x_f < 0$ or $x_f > 0$, respectively, for $b_f \gg a_f > 0$. Therefore, in order to give the assignment $(m_1, m_2, m_3) = (m_u, m_t, m_c)$, we take the up-quark mass matrix M_u as

$$\widehat{M}_u = a_u \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + b_u \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1-\xi_u \\ 0 & 1-\xi_u & 1 \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{3.1}$$

where we have put $x_f = 1 - \xi_f$ (ξ_f is a small positive parameter). Similarly, if we want to give $(m_1, m_2, m_3) = (m_d, m_s, m_b)$, we should take

$$\widehat{M}_d = a_d \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + b_d \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -(1-\xi_d) \\ 0 & -(1-\xi_d) & 1 \end{pmatrix} \ . \tag{3.2}$$

From Eqs. (3.1) and (3.2), the following general form of $\widehat{M}_f$ is suggested:

$$\widehat{M}_f = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_f & a_f \\ a_f & b_f & (1-\xi_f) b_f e^{i\beta_f} \\ a_f & (1-\xi_f) b_f e^{i\beta_f} & b_f \end{pmatrix} \ . \tag{3.3}$$

On the other hand, we must consider the origin of $\delta_3 - \delta_2 \simeq \pi$, which is required in Eq. (2.21) in Model II. Therefore, we extend the flavor $2 \leftrightarrow 3$ symmetry which is generated by the operator T_{23} , (2.19), to a generalized $2 \leftrightarrow 3$ symmetry which is generated by

$$T_{23}^{\phi} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{-i\phi} \\ 0 & e^{i\phi} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{3.4}$$

as

$$T_{23}^{\phi} M (T_{23}^{\phi})^T = M \ . \tag{3.5}$$

(In the present model, too, we assume that the mass matrix M is symmetric, i.e. $M^T = M$.) The requirement (3.5) leads to relations

$$M_{12} = M_{13} e^{-i\phi} \ , \quad M_{22} = M_{33} e^{-2i\phi} \ , \tag{3.6}$$

but the relative phases among M_{13}, M_{23} and M_{33} are free. Therefore, as trial, we assume that M_{13}, M_{23} and M_{33} have the same phases, i.e. we assume the mass matrix form

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a e^{-i\phi} & a \\ a e^{-i\phi} & b e^{-2i\phi} & (1-\xi) b \\ a & (1-\xi) b & b \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{3.7}$$

where a and b are positive parameters of the model. This mass matrix (3.7) can give a nearly bimaximal mixing as we show in Appendix. However, we have still 4 parameters in the mass matrix (3.7). We would like to seek for a model with a more concise structure. As we see in Appendix (A.5), in order to give three different mass eigenvalues, we may consider either model with $\phi = 0$ or $\xi = 0$. However, if we take a model with $\phi = 0$, we must introduce an alternative phase factor in order to explain the observed CP violation in the quark sectors.

In the present model, we simply assume a texture with $\xi = 0$ in the texture (3.7):

$$M = a \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{-i\phi} & 1 \\ e^{-i\phi} & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + b \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2i\phi} & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a e^{-i\phi} & a \\ a e^{-i\phi} & b e^{-2i\phi} & b \\ a & b & b \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{3.8}$$

i.e. we have assumed a democratic form except for phases. It is convenient to rewrite the texture (3.8) as

$$M = P(0,\ -\phi,\ 0) \cdot \widehat{M} \cdot P(0,\ -\phi,\ 0) \ , \tag{3.9}$$

where

$$\widehat{M} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a & a \\ a & b & b e^{i\phi} \\ a & b e^{i\phi} & b \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{3.10}$$

$$P(\delta_1,\ \delta_2,\ \delta_3) = \mathrm{diag}(e^{i\delta_1},\ e^{i\delta_2}, e^{i\delta_3}) \ . \tag{3.11}$$

The matrix $\widehat{M}$ (also M) has the following eigenvalues:

$$\begin{aligned} m_1 &= b \left(\sqrt{\cos^2 \frac{\phi}{2} + 2k^2} - \cos \frac{\phi}{2} \right) \ , \\ m_2 &= b \left(\sqrt{\cos^2 \frac{\phi}{2} + 2k^2} + \cos \frac{\phi}{2} \right) \ , \\ m_3 &= 2b \sin \frac{\phi}{2} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where $k = a/b$. Inversely, from Eq. (3.12), we can evaluate the parameters a, b and ϕ as follows:

$$a = \sqrt{\frac{m_1 m_2}{2}} \ , \tag{3.13}$$

$$b = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{m_3^2 + (m_2 - m_1)^2} \ , \tag{3.14}$$

$$\tan\frac{\phi}{2} = \frac{m_3}{m_2 - m_1} \ . \tag{3.15}$$

The mixing matrix $\widehat{U}$ for the matrix $\widehat{M}$ is given by

$$\widehat{U} = \widehat{R} \cdot P(\frac{\phi}{4}, \frac{\phi}{4}, -\frac{\phi}{4}) \ , \tag{3.16}$$

$$\widehat{R} = \begin{pmatrix} ce^{-i\phi/2} & se^{-i\phi/2} & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}s & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}s & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{3.17}$$

where the mixing matrix $\widehat{U}$ has been defined by

$$\widehat{U}^\dagger \widehat{M} \widehat{U}^* = D \equiv \mathrm{diag}(-m_1, \ m_2, \ m_3) \ . \tag{3.18}$$

Therefore, the mixing matrix U for the matrix M is given by

$$U = P(0, -\phi, 0) \cdot \widehat{U} = P(0, -\phi, 0) \cdot \widehat{R} \cdot P(\frac{\phi}{4}, \frac{\phi}{4}, -\frac{\phi}{4}) \ . \tag{3.19}$$

In order to give the phenomenological value $\delta_3 - \delta_2 = \pi - \varepsilon$ in Model II, we assume

$$\phi_u = \varepsilon_u \ , \quad \phi_d = \pi - \varepsilon_d \ , \tag{3.20}$$

which lead to the mass assignments $(m_{u1}, m_{u2}, m_{u3}) = (m_u, m_t, m_c)$ and $(m_{d1}, m_{d2}, m_{d3}) = (m_d, m_s, m_b)$, respectively. Then, we obtain

$$U_u = P(0, -\varepsilon_u, 0) \cdot \widehat{R}_u \cdot P(\frac{\varepsilon_u}{4}, \frac{\varepsilon_u}{4}, -\frac{\varepsilon_u}{4}) \ , \tag{3.21}$$

$$U_d = P(0, \pi - \varepsilon_d, 0) \cdot \widehat{R}_d \cdot P(\frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{\varepsilon_d}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{\varepsilon_d}{4}, -\frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{\varepsilon_d}{4}) \ , \tag{3.22}$$

so that we obtain the CKM matrix

$$V = T_{23} U_u^\dagger U_d = T_{23} P(-\frac{\varepsilon_u}{4}, -\frac{\varepsilon_u}{4}, \frac{\varepsilon_u}{4}) \cdot \widehat{R}_u^\dagger \cdot P(0, \pi - \varepsilon_d + \varepsilon_u, 0) \cdot \widehat{R}_d \cdot P(\frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{\varepsilon_d}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{\varepsilon_d}{4}, -\frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{\varepsilon_d}{4}) \ , \tag{3.23}$$

which essentially gives the same results as the mixing matrix (2.20) in Model II (but with $\delta_2 - \delta_3 = \pi - \varepsilon_d + \varepsilon_u$) as far as $|V_{ij}|$ are concerned. In addition to those predictions, we can obtain a new prediction

$$|V_{cd}| = \cos\frac{\phi_d - \phi_u}{2} = \sin\frac{\varepsilon_d + \varepsilon_u}{2} \ . \tag{3.24}$$

Since, from the formula (3.15), we obtain

$$\tan\frac{\varepsilon_u}{2} = \frac{m_c}{m_t - m_u} \simeq \frac{m_c}{m_t} \ , \tag{3.25}$$

$$\tan\frac{\varepsilon_d}{2} = \frac{m_s - m_d}{m_b} \simeq \frac{m_s}{m_b} \ , \tag{3.26}$$

we can predict

$$|V_{cb}| \simeq \frac{m_s}{m_b} + \frac{m_c}{m_t} = 0.033 \ , \tag{3.27}$$

by using the quark mass values [6] at $\mu = m_Z$. The value (3.27) is somewhat smaller compared with the observed value [7] $|V_{cd}| = 0.0412 \pm 0.0020$, but it is roughly in agreement with the experimental value. For reference, the parameter values of a, b and ε which are estimated from the observed quark masses at $\mu = m_Z$ are listed in Table I.

TABLE I: Parameter values evaluated from the quark mass values at $\mu = m_Z$. For reference, in addition to those in the present model with $\xi = 0$, those in Model II (with $\varepsilon = 0$) are listed.

		M_u	M_d	M_e
	$(m_1,\ m_2,\ m_3)$	$(m_u,\ m_t,\ m_c)$	$(m_d,\ m_s,\ m_b)$	$(m_e,\ m_\mu,\ m_\tau)$
Model	a/b	0.00507	0.00986	0.00572
with	ε	$\varepsilon_u = \phi_u$	$\varepsilon_d = \pi - \phi_d$	$\varepsilon_e = \pi - \phi_e$
$\xi = 0$		= 0.00748 (0.429°)	= 0.0591 (3.39°)	= 0.117 (6.70°)
	b	90.5 GeV	1.50 GeV	0.875 GeV
Model	a/b	0.00506	0.00958	0.00541
with	ξ	0.00745	0.0574	0.111
$\varepsilon = 0$	b	90.2 GeV	1.54 GeV	0.924 GeV

IV. NEUTRINO MASS MATRIX

Now, let us investigate the lepton sectors under the ansatz (1.4). We again consider that the charged lepton mass matrix M_e is given by the texture (1.4) with $\phi_e = \pi - \varepsilon_e$ as well as M_d. In Model I, the phenomenological parameter $\delta_3 - \delta_2$ in the lepton sector was required as $\delta_3 - \delta_2 = \pi/2$. This suggests $\phi_\nu = \pi/2$ in the present model. At present, there is no reason that we should take $\phi_\nu = \pi/2$. However, from the phenomenological point of view, it is worth investigating the possibility $\phi_\nu = \pi/2$.

When we consider that the neutrino masses are generated by the seesaw mechanism [10], the neutrino mass matrix M_ν is given by $M_\nu = M_D M_R^{-1} M_D^T$, where M_D is a Dirac neutrino mass matrix and M_R is a Majorana mass matrix of right–handed neutrino ν_{Ri}. Although the origin of the mass generation of M_R is different from that M_u, M_d, M_e and M_D which are generated by Higgs scalars of SU(2)$_L$ doublet, since the texture (1.4) is based on the properties of flavors of $u_{L/R}$, $d_{L/R}$, $e_{L/R}$ and $\nu_{L/R}$, it is likely that the Majorana mass matrix M_R has also the same texture as the Dirac mass matrix M_D. However, note that even if we assume that the mass matrices M_D and M_R are given by the texture (1.4), in general, the matrix $M_D M_R^{-1} M_D^T$ does not take the texture (1.4). Only when we consider $\phi_D = \phi_R$, the expression of $M_D M_R^{-1} M_D^T$ becomes a little simpler. (In order that $M_D M_R^{-1} M_D^T$ has the texture (1.4) completely, the parameter values have to satisfy the relations $a_D/a_R = b_D/b_R$ and $\phi_D = \phi_R$.) In the present paper, we assume only that $\phi_D = \phi_R \equiv \phi_\nu$ and we do not assume $a_D/a_R = b_D/b_R$. Then, we obtain

$$M_\nu = M_D\ M_R^{-1}\ M_D^T = e^{i(\frac{\phi_\nu}{2} - \frac{\pi}{2} + \varepsilon)} P(-\frac{1}{2}\phi_\nu + \frac{1}{2}\pi - \varepsilon\ , -\phi_\nu\ , 0) \cdot \widehat{M} \cdot P(-\frac{1}{2}\phi_\nu + \frac{1}{2}\pi - \varepsilon\ , -\phi_\nu\ , 0)\ , \tag{4.1}$$

$$\widehat{M} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a & a \\ a & b & be^{i\widehat{\phi}} \\ a & be^{i\widehat{\phi}} & b \end{pmatrix}\ , \tag{4.2}$$

$$a \equiv \frac{a_D^2}{a_R}\ , \tag{4.3}$$

$$b \equiv \frac{b_D^2}{b_R} \sin\frac{\phi_\nu}{2} \sqrt{1 + r^2 \cot^2\frac{\phi_\nu}{2}}\ , \tag{4.4}$$

$$r \equiv 2\frac{a_D b_R}{b_D a_R} - \left(\frac{a_D b_R}{b_D a_R}\right)^2\ , \tag{4.5}$$

$$\tan\varepsilon = r \cot\frac{\phi_\nu}{2}\ , \tag{4.6}$$

$$\widehat{\phi} = \pi - 2\varepsilon\ . \tag{4.7}$$

Now, we assume $\phi_\nu = \pi/2$ and $a_D/b_D \ll a_R/b_R$, (i.e. $r \ll 1$), so that we obtain

$$\tan\varepsilon = r \ . \tag{4.8}$$

Since the mixing matrices U_e and U_ν are given by

$$U_{eL} = P(0,\ -\phi_e,\ 0)\cdot \widehat{R}_e \cdot P(\frac{1}{4}\phi_e,\ \frac{1}{4}\phi_e,\ -\frac{1}{4}\phi_e)\ , \tag{4.9}$$

$$U_{\nu L} = e^{i\frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon-\frac{\pi}{4})} P(\frac{1}{4}\pi-\varepsilon,\ -\frac{\pi}{2},\ 0)\cdot \widehat{R}_\nu \cdot P(\frac{1}{4}\widehat{\phi},\ \frac{1}{4}\widehat{\phi},\ -\frac{1}{4}\widehat{\phi})\ , \tag{4.10}$$

where $\phi_e = \pi - \varepsilon_e$, $\widehat{\phi} = \pi - 2\varepsilon$, and $\widehat{R}_e$ and $\widehat{R}_\nu$ are given by Eq.(3.17), the lepton mixing matrix $V_\ell = U_{eL}^\dagger U_{\nu L}$ is expressed as follows:

$$V_\ell = \begin{pmatrix} c_e c_\nu e^{i\delta_1} + \rho s_e s_\nu & c_e s_\nu e^{i\delta_1} - \rho s_e c_\nu & -\sigma s_e \\ s_e c_\nu e^{i\delta_1} - \rho c_e s_\nu & s_e s_\nu e^{i\delta_1} + \rho c_e c_\nu & \sigma c_e \\ -\sigma s_\nu & \sigma c_\nu & \rho \end{pmatrix}\ , \tag{4.11}$$

where

$$s_e = \sqrt{\frac{m_e}{m_\mu + m_e}}\ ,\quad c_e = \sqrt{\frac{m_\mu}{m_\mu + m_e}}\ , \tag{4.12}$$

$$s_\nu = \sqrt{\frac{m_{\nu 1}}{m_{\nu 2} + m_{\nu 1}}}\ ,\quad c_\nu = \sqrt{\frac{m_{\nu 2}}{m_{\nu 2} + m_{\nu 1}}}\ , \tag{4.13}$$

$$\delta_1 = \frac{\pi}{4} - \varepsilon + \frac{\widehat{\phi}}{2} - \frac{\phi_e}{2}\ , \tag{4.14}$$

and ρ and σ are defined by Eqs. (2.12) and (2.13) with $\delta_2 = \phi_e - \pi = \varepsilon_e - \pi/2$ and $\delta_3 = 0$. Exactly speaking, the mixing matrix V_ℓ is given by

$$V_\ell = e^{i\frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon-\frac{\pi}{4})} P(-\frac{1}{4}\phi_e,\ -\frac{1}{4}\phi_e,\ \frac{1}{4}\phi_e)\cdot \widehat{V}_\ell \cdot P(\frac{1}{4}\widehat{\phi},\ \frac{1}{4}\widehat{\phi},\ -\frac{1}{4}\widehat{\phi})\ , \tag{4.15}$$

where $\widehat{V}_\ell$ in the expression (4.15) is defined by V_ℓ in Eq. (4.11). As far as the magnitudes of $(V_\ell)_{ij}$ are concerned, we can drop the phase factors $e^{i\frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon-\frac{\pi}{4})}P(-\frac{1}{4}\phi_e, -\frac{1}{4}\phi_e, \frac{1}{4}\phi_e)$ and $P(\frac{1}{4}\widehat{\phi}, \frac{1}{4}\widehat{\phi}, -\frac{1}{4}\widehat{\phi})$. Of course, when we deal with neutrinoless double beta decay, a CP violation process, and so on, we must exactly take those phase factors into consideration. For a time, since we discuss $\sin^2 2\theta_{atm}$ and $\tan^2\theta_{solar}$, we neglect those phase factors.

For $\sin^2 2\theta_{atm}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sin^2 2\theta_{atm} &= 4|(V_\ell)_{23}|^2|(V_\ell)_{33}|^2 = 4|\sigma|^2|\rho|^2 c_e^2 = \frac{m_\mu}{m_\mu+m_e}\sin^2(\frac{\pi}{2}-\varepsilon_e) \\ &\simeq 1 - \frac{m_e}{m_\mu} - 4\left(\frac{m_\mu}{m_\tau}\right)^2 = 0.98\ . \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

We also obtain

$$|(V_\ell)_{13}|^2 = |\sigma|^2 s_e^2 \simeq \frac{m_e}{2m_\mu}\left(1 - 2\frac{m_\mu}{m_\tau}\right) = 0.0021\ . \tag{4.17}$$

These values (4.16) and (4.17) are consistent with the observed values [11, 12].

For $\tan^2\theta_{solar}$, we obtain as follows. Note that in the expression $(V_\ell)_{ij}$ $(i,j=1,2)$ given by Eq. (4.11), the relative phase of the first term to the second term, $\delta_1 - (\delta_3+\delta_2)/2$, is given by

$$\delta_1 - \frac{\delta_3+\delta_2}{2} = \left(\frac{\pi}{4} - \varepsilon - \frac{1}{2}\widehat{\phi} + \frac{1}{2}\phi_e\right) - \frac{1}{2}\left(-\frac{\pi}{2} + \phi_e\right) = 0\ , \tag{4.18}$$

so that we can write $(V_\ell)_{ij}$ as

$$(V_\ell)_{11} = (c_e c_\nu + |\rho| s_e s_\nu) e^{i\delta_1} \quad , \tag{4.19}$$

$$(V_\ell)_{12} = (c_e s_\nu - |\rho| s_e c_\nu) e^{i\delta_1} \quad , \tag{4.20}$$

and so on. Therefore, we obtain

$$\tan^2\theta_{solar} = \frac{|(V_\ell)_{12}|^2}{|(V_\ell)_{11}|^2} = \left(\frac{\frac{s_\nu}{c_\nu} - |\rho| \frac{s_e}{c_e}}{1 + |\rho| \frac{s_e}{c_e} \frac{s_\nu}{c_\nu}} \right)^2 \simeq \left(\frac{s_\nu}{c_\nu} \right)^2 = \frac{m_{\nu 1}}{m_{\nu 2}} \quad , \tag{4.21}$$

for $s_\nu/c_\nu = \sqrt{m_{\nu 1}/m_{\nu 2}} \gg s_e/c_e = \sqrt{m_e/m_\mu}$. (The alternative case $s_\nu/c_\nu \leq s_e/c_e$ is ruled out because the case leads to a very small value of $\tan^2\theta_{solar}$.)

For Δm^2_{solar} and Δm^2_{atm}, from Eq. (3.12) with $\phi = \widehat{\phi} = \pi - 2\varepsilon$, we can obtain

$$\Delta m^2_{21} \equiv m_2^2 - m_1^2 = 4b^2 \sin\varepsilon \sqrt{\sin^2\varepsilon + 2k^2} \quad , \tag{4.22}$$

$$\Delta m^2_{32} \equiv m_3^2 - m_2^2 = 4b^2 \left(1 - \frac{3}{2}\sin^2\varepsilon - \frac{1}{2}k^2 - 2\sin\varepsilon\sqrt{\sin^2\varepsilon + 2k^2} \right) \quad , \tag{4.23}$$

where

$$k \equiv \frac{a}{b} = \sqrt{2} \frac{a_D^2 b_R}{b_R^2 a_R} \cos\varepsilon \quad , \tag{4.24}$$

so that we predict

$$R \equiv \frac{\Delta m^2_{21}}{\Delta m^2_{32}} \simeq \sin\varepsilon \sqrt{\sin^2\varepsilon + 2k^2} \quad , \tag{4.25}$$

for small ε^2 and k^2. On the other hand, from Eqs. (3.13) – (3.14) [i.e. $\tan\varepsilon = (m_{\nu 2} - m_{\nu 1})/m_{\nu 3}$], we obtain

$$k \equiv \frac{a}{b} = \sqrt{\frac{2 m_{\nu 1} m_{\nu 2}}{m^2_{\nu 3} + (m_{\nu 2} - m_{\nu 1})^2}} = \sqrt{2} \frac{\sqrt{m_{\nu 1}/m_{\nu 2}}}{1 - m_{\nu 1}/m_{\nu 2}} \sin\varepsilon \ , \tag{4.26}$$

Therefore, if we give a value

$$x \equiv \frac{k}{\sin\varepsilon} \ , \tag{4.27}$$

we can obtain the value of $m_{\nu 1}/m_{\nu 2}$ as follows:

$$\tan^2\theta_{solar} \simeq \frac{m_{\nu 1}}{m_{\nu 2}} = \frac{1}{x^2} \left(1 + x^2 - \sqrt{1 + 2x^2} \right) \ . \tag{4.28}$$

In the present model, since the value of $R \equiv \Delta m^2_{21}/\Delta m^2_{32}$ depends on the parameters ε and x, the value of $\tan^2\theta_{solar}$ cannot be predicted from the charged lepton masses only. In other words, if we give the values R and $\tan^2\theta_{solar}$, we can determine the values x and ε (k and ε), so that we can also determine the value of $m_{\nu 1}$, $m_{\nu 2}$ and $m_{\nu 3}$. In Table II, we list the numerical predictions $m_{\nu 1}/m_{\nu 2} = \tan^2\theta_{solar}$ and $(m_{\nu 1},\ m_{\nu 2},\ m_{\nu 3})$ for typical values of $x = k/\sin\varepsilon$, where we have used the input values [12, 13, 14]

$$R_{obs} = \frac{6.9 \times 10^{-5}\ \ \mathrm{eV}^2}{2.5 \times 10^{-3}\ \ \mathrm{eV}^2} = 2.76 \times 10^{-2} \ , \tag{4.29}$$

and $\Delta m^2_{atm} = 2.5 \times 10^{-3}\ \ \mathrm{eV}^2$. The value $m_{\nu 1}/m_{\nu 2}$ in Table II has been evaluated from Eq. (4.26). From the relation

$$R = \left(\frac{m_{\nu 2}}{m_{\nu 3}} \right)^2 \frac{1 - (\tan^2\theta_{solar})^2}{1 - (m_{\nu 2}/m_{\nu 3})^2} \ , \tag{4.30}$$

TABLE II: Values $\tan^2\theta_{solar}$ and $m_{\nu i}$ $(i=1,2,3)$ for typical value of $x \equiv k/\sin\varepsilon$

x	$m_{\nu 1}/m_{\nu 2} \simeq \tan^2\theta_{solar}$	$r_{23}=m_{\nu 2}/m_{\nu 3}$	$m_{\nu 1}$ [eV]	$m_{\nu 2}$ [eV]	$m_{\nu 3}$ [eV]	$\tan\varepsilon$
2	1/2=0.5	0.188	0.0048	0.0096	0.0509	0.094
$\sqrt{2}$	$(3-\sqrt{5})/2=0.382$	0.177	0.0034	0.0090	0.0508	0.109
$\sqrt{3/2}$	$1/3=0.333$	0.174	0.0029	0.0088	0.0508	0.116

we obtain

$$r_{23} \equiv \frac{m_{\nu 2}}{m_{\nu 3}} = \sqrt{\frac{R}{1-\tan^4\theta_{solar}+R}} \ . \tag{4.31}$$

The mass values $m_{\nu i}$ in Table II have been obtained from

$$m_{\nu 3} = \sqrt{\frac{\Delta m^2_{atm}}{1-r^2_{23}}} \ , \tag{4.32}$$

$m_{\nu 2}=r_{23}m_{\nu 3}$ and $m_{\nu 1}=m_{\nu 2}\tan^2\theta_{solar}$. The value of $\tan\varepsilon$ in Table II has been estimated, not from the approximate relation (4.25), but from the exact relation

$$\tan\varepsilon = \frac{m_{\nu 2}}{m_{\nu 3}}\left(1-\frac{m_{\nu 1}}{m_{\nu 2}}\right) = r_{23}(1-\tan^2\theta_{solar}) \ . \tag{4.33}$$

V. SUMMARY

In conclusion, we have proposed a universal texture (1.4) of quark and lepton mass matrices. The mass matrix M is invariant under the extended flavor $2 \leftrightarrow 3$ permutation T^{ϕ}_{23}, (3.4), as $T^{\phi}_{23}M(T^{\phi}_{23})^T = M$. Besides, the matrix elements M_{ij} $(i=2,3)$ are exactly democratic apart from their phases, i.e.

$$M_f = a_f \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{-i\phi_f} & 1 \\ e^{-i\phi_f} & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \langle H^0_A\rangle + b_f \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2i\phi_f} & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \langle H^0_B\rangle \ . \tag{5.1}$$

The mass matrix M is described by two parameters ϕ and a/b, as for as the mass ratios and mixings are concerned.

For quark sectors M_u and M_d, we take the parameter ϕ as $\phi_u = \varepsilon_u$ and $\phi_d = \pi - \varepsilon_d$, respectively, where ε_u and ε_d are small positive parameters. Then, we can obtain successful relations for the CKM mixing parameters in terms of quark masses. (Note that, in Models I and II, the value of $|V_{cb}|$ is given by a phenomenological parameter $(\delta_3-\delta_2)$ independently of the quark mass ratios, while, in the present model, $|V_{cb}|$ is given in terms of quark mass rations as shown in Eq. (3.27).) For the charged lepton mass matrix M_e, we take $\phi_e = \pi - \varepsilon_e$ as well as $\phi_d = \pi-\varepsilon_d$, while, for the neutrino mass matrix M_ν, we take $\phi_\nu = \pi/2$ in order to give a nearly bimaximal mixing. The neutrino mass matrix M_ν is described by two parameters ε and $k \equiv a/b$. The predictions $\sin^2 2\theta_{atm}$ and $|(V_\ell)_{13}|^2$ are given only in terms of charged lepton masses independently of the parameters ε and k, as shown in Eqs. (4.16) and (4.17). These predictions are favorable to the data. On the other hand, the quantities $\tan^2\theta_{solar}$, $R \equiv \Delta m^2_{solar}/\Delta m^2_{atm}$ and $m_{\nu i}$ $(i=1,2,3)$ are dependent on the parameters ε and k in the neutrino mass matrix M_ν. In Table II, we have listed the predictions for typical values of $x \equiv k/\sin\varepsilon$.

Although we have taken $\phi_e = \pi - \varepsilon_e$ for the charged lepton sector, it is not essential. If we take $\phi_e = \varepsilon_e$ as well as ϕ_u, the results for the neutrino mixing are substantially uncharged (e.g. Eqs. (4.16) and (4.17) become merely $\sin^2 2\theta_{atm} \simeq 1 - m_e/m_\tau$ and $|(V_\ell)_{13}|^2 \simeq m_e/2m_\tau$, respectively). However, the choice $\phi_\nu = \pi/2$ is essential. If we choose another value of ϕ_ν, we cannot obtain $\sin^2 2\theta_{atm} \simeq 1$. It is an open question why we must choose $\phi = \pi/2$ only for the neutrino sector.

Since as seen in Table I the parameter values of ϕ (and a/b) which are determined from the observed fermion masses are different from each other (i.e. $a_e \neq d_d$, $b_e \neq b_d$ and $\phi_e \neq \phi_d$), the present model cannot be applied to a grand unification theory (GUT) model straightforwardly. However, for example, in an SU(5) GUT model, with matter fields $\overline{5}+10+\overline{5}'+5'$ [15], we can consider a $\overline{5} \leftrightarrow \overline{5}'$ mixing. Therefore, the problem that the parameter values are not universal is not so serious defect even for a GUT model. Because of its simpleness of the texture (1.4) with few parameters, it will be worthwhile taking the present universal texture seriously,

Appendix

It is convenient to rewrite the mass matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & ae^{-i\phi} & a \\ ae^{-i\phi} & be^{-2i\phi} & (1-\xi)b \\ a & (1-\xi)b & b \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{A.1}$$

as

$$M = P(0,-\phi,0)\cdot \widehat{M} \cdot P(0,-\phi,0) \ , \tag{A.2}$$

where

$$P(\delta_1,\delta_2,\delta_3) = \mathrm{diag}(e^{i\delta_1}, e^{i\delta_2}, e^{i\delta_3}) \ , \tag{A.3}$$

$$\widehat{M} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a & a \\ a & b & (1-\xi)be^{i\phi} \\ a & (1-\xi)be^{i\phi} & b \end{pmatrix} \ . \tag{A.4}$$

The eigenvalues m_i and mixing matrix $\widehat{U}$ of the mass matrix $\widehat{M}$ are follows:

$$\begin{array}{l} m_1 = \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{p^2+8k^2}-p)b \ , \\ m_2 = \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{p^2+8k^2}+p)b \ , \\ m_3 = qb \ , \end{array} \tag{A.5}$$

$$\widehat{U} = \widehat{R}\cdot P(-\frac{\delta}{2}, -\frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2}) \ , \tag{A.6}$$

$$\widehat{R} = \begin{pmatrix} ce^{i\delta} & se^{i\delta} & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}s & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}s & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{A.7}$$

where $k = a/b$,

$$p^2 = \xi^2 + 4(1-\xi)\cos^2\frac{\phi}{2} \ , \tag{A.8}$$

$$q^2 = \xi^2 + 4(1-\xi)\sin^2\frac{\phi}{2} \ , \tag{A.9}$$

$$\tan\delta = -\frac{(1-\xi)\sin\phi}{1+(1-\xi)\cos\phi} \ , \tag{A.10}$$

and the mixing matrix $\widehat{U}$ is defined by

$$\widehat{U}^\dagger \widehat{M} \widehat{U}^* = D \equiv \mathrm{diag}(-m_1, m_2, m_3) \ . \tag{A.11}$$

Therefore, the mixing matrix U for the matrix M is given by

$$U = P(0,-\phi,0)\cdot\widehat{U} = P(0,-\phi,0)\cdot\widehat{R}\cdot P(-\frac{\delta}{2}, -\frac{\delta}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2}) \ . \tag{A.12}$$

If we put $\phi = 0$, then the results (A.5) – (A.10) become those in Models I and II. The model (1.4) in the present paper corresponds to one with $\xi = 0$.

[1] Y. Koide, H. Nishiura, K. Matsuda, T. Kikuchi and T. Fukuyama, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 093006 (2002).

[2] For instance, K. Oda, E. Takasugi, M. Tanaka and M. Yoshimura, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 055001 (1999); K. Matsuda, Y. Koide and T. Fukuyama, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 053015 (2001).

[3] Y. Koide and J. Sato, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 056004 (2003).

[4] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 531 (1963); M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49**, 652 (1973).

[5] G. C. Branco and L. Lavoura, Phys. Rev. **D44**, R582 (1991). Also see, H. Fritzsch and Z. Z. Xing, Phys. Lett. **B413**, 396 (1997); Phys. Rev. **D57**, 594 (1998).

[6] H. Fusaoka and Y. Koide, Phys. Rev. **D57**, 3986 (1998).

[7] K. Hagiwara *et al.*, Particle Data Group, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 010001 (2002), (http://pdg.lbl.gov/).

[8] K. Matsuda and H. Nishiura, hep-ph/0309272 (2003).

[9] S. Weinberg, Ann. (N.Y.) Acad. Sci. **38**, 185 (1977); H. Fritzsh, Phys. Lett. **73B**, 317 (1978)G Nucl. Phys. **B155**, 189 (1979); H. Georgi and D. V. Nanopoulos, *ibid.* **B155**, 52 (1979).

[10] T. Yanagida, in Proceedings of the Workshop on the Unified Theory and Baryon Number in the Universe, edited by O. Sawada and A. Sugamoto (KEK, Tsukuba, 1979), p. 95; M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, in Supergravity, edited by P. van Nieuwenhuizen and D. Freedman (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1979), p. 315; G. Senjanović and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 912 (1980).

[11] M. Apollonio *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B466**, 415 (1999).

[12] Super-Kamiokande collaboration, Y. Fukuda *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1562 (1998); M. Shiozawa, Talk presented at *Neutrino 2002*, Munich, Germany, May 2002 (http://neutrino.t30.physik.tu-muenchen.de/).

[13] J. N. Bahcall, M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia and C. Penã-Garay, JHEP **0108**, 014 (2001); G. L. Fogli, E. Lisi, D. Montanino and A. Palazzo, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 093007 (2001); V. Barger, D. Marfatia and K. Whisnant, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 011302 (2002); P. I. Krastev and A. Yu. Smirnov, Phys. Rev. **D65**, 073022 (2002); SNO collaboration, Q. R. Ahmad *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 011302 (2002).

[14] KamLAND collaboration, K. Eguchi, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 021802 (2003).

[15] M. Bando and T. Kugo, Prog. Theor. Phys. **101**, 1313 (1999). Also see, J. Sato and T. Yanagida, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **77**, 293 (1999). For a recent model with $\overline{5}$-$\overline{5}'$ mixing, for example, Y. Koide, Phys. Lett. **B574**, 82 (2003).